DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 004 HE 004 898

AUTHOR	Parmeter, Tom; Faxio, John
TITLE	The Thirteen College Program: Teacher Evaluation of the 4th Annual Summer Curriculum Development Conference and Attitudes Toward Undergraduate Education.
INSTITUTION	Institute for Services to Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 70
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; Educational Programs; *Evaluation; Experimental Programs; *Higher Education; *Negro Institutions; Questionnaires; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Teachers; *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	Institute for Services to Education; ISE; TCCP; *Thirteen College Curriculum Program

ABSTRACT

During the summer of 1970, the Institute for Services to Education (ISE) held its fourth annual summer writing conference for faculty members of predominantly black institutions of higher education. The purpose was to continue the process of teacher development of undergraduate curriculum materials and concomitant instructional practices. Attending the 6-week conference were faculty, staff, and graduate students from 23 predominantly black institutions. The conference was divided into units by the curriculum areas, including: English, mathematics, biology, humanities, physical sciences, social institutions, and philosophy. Questionnaires were distributed near the end of the conference to elicit the participant's attitudes toward undergraduate instruction in general, their attitudes and opinions about the quality of materials and procedures developed during the conference, and their feelings about the mechanics of the conference and the quality of the conference staff. This report presents and discusses the responses of a sample (40) of teachers who participated in the conference as members of the original 13 College Program experimental units. The results are presented both by total summaries of responses and by responses according to the teachers' different curriculum areas. Selected summaries are presented by the number of years the teacher had participated in the program, by the teacher's sex, and by the teacher's race. General rating tendencies are also presented. (Author/PG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085004

HE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE THIRTEEN COLLEGE PROGRAM: TEACHER EVALUATION OF THE 4TH ANNUAL SUMMER CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

by

Tom Parmeter and John Faxio

Number 1: November, 1970

HE 004 898

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Introduction

During the summer of 1970, the Institute for Services to Education (ISE) held its fourth annual summer writing conference for faculty members of predominantly Black institutions of higher education. The purpose of this and previous conferences was to continue the process of teacher development of undergraduate curriculum materials and concommitant instructional practices. As part of a larger program of educational development and institutional change in predominantly Black colleges, the conference had as its more specific objectives the actual development of generally open-ended materials in a number of curriculum areas, the establishment of more open-ended or student-oriented teachings approaches, and the increased "valuing" of these activites as well as the development of a broader, more participatory perception of undergraduate education.

Attending the six-week conference were faculty, staff, and graduate students from 23 predominantly Black institutions. Each institution was a member of one of three separate consortiums of colleges respectively engaged at different levels in attacking the problems of undergraduate education. The oldest, and most advanced consortium, -- The Thirteen College Curriculum Program[1] -- was represented by teachers participating in the experimental program unit on each campus, some with as many as four years of program experience, as well as an expanding group of teachers from the colleges' traditional programs. The colleges in this consortium were making plans to broadly expand the program materials and instructional approaches across the respective freshman classes. The Five College Consortium[2] was a new group of colleges who joined together to apply the 13 College approach, but beginning at a more advanced point with plans for more rapid expansion than was possible in the pioneering efforts of the 13 College Program. The Three Universities Consortium[3] was a group of institutions beginning to build a Master's degree level program of training for the development of undergraduate teachers employing the approach to curriculum and instructional development used by ISE with faculty already teaching at the undergraduate level.

The conference was divided into semi-autonomous units by the curriculum areas[4] included in the experimental programs on each campus. In these units, each with its own staff and consultants, teachers worked on developing new materials, re-working previous materials, organizing materials into larger groupings or sequences, demonstrating various instructional approaches, and testing materials on groups of students preparing to enter college in the fall. Although the conference was administered by an ISE staff, the curriculum areas were organized internally by committees of teachers interested in some common element with staff and consultants as resources to these groupings. Rather than arriving at a single set of materials or curriculum, the idea was to develop and demonstrate as much material as possible in order for the teacher to pick and choose what appeared to him best for his given situation. In the demonstration and testing of materials, "open-endedness" (the avoidance of singular learning approaches or singular "correct" learned responses) was encouraged.

The primary questions facing ISE are the degree to which the conference accomplished this desired state, the nature of the perception of the conference by the teachers, the degree to which the conditions of the conference were conducive to the development of new materials and instructional approaches, and the degree to which the attitudes of teachers toward undergraduate education were congruent with ISE's underlying assumptions and approach.

Near the end of the conference, evaluation questionaires were distributed to all conference participants. These questionaires were designed to elicit the participant's attitudes toward undergraduate instruction in general, their attitudes and opinions about the quality of materials and procedures developed during the conference, and their feelings about the mechanics of the conference and the quality of the conference staff. Some of the items were drawn from a national survey of college faculty attitudes[5] and corresponded to questions asked on a pre-conference questionaire. Other items were specifically developed by the ISE evaluation staff, and a series of open-ended questions were included to allow participants to generate their own special concerns.

This report presents and discusses the responses of a sample of teachers who participated in the conference as members of the original 13 College Program experimental units. The sample, approximately one-third of the 119 teachers included in this category, was determined simply on the basis of identifying when possible the returned questionaires from this group out of the 83 total questionaires returned. The results are presented both by total summaries of responses and by responses according to the teachers' different curriculum areas. Selected summaries are presented by the number of years the teacher had participated in the program, by the teacher's sex, and by the teachers' race. General rating tendencies are also presented.

Background

The Institute for Services to Education is a non-profit educational corporation whose main focus is improving access to and retention within higher education for disadvantaged youth. During the past four years ISE has worked cooperatively with 13 predominantly Black institutions of higher education on problems related to undergraduate curriculum innovation and instructional development. Basically, the approach is an attempt to "liberalize" the curriculum and "democratize" the classroom. For pragmatic as well as theoretical reasons, the primary efforts have been directed toward the student's freshman year, continuing, in part, through the sophomore year. Central to these efforts has been the establishment of an experimental unit -- a "college within a college" -- on each campus to provide the degree of necessary independence for the establishment of a new, flexible curriculum; the transfer of greater responsiblity for curricular development to the teacher and the transfer of greater responsibility for direction and choice in the classroom to the student; the gradual development, testing, and expansion of materials and teaching style across each institution; and a summer writing conference where participating faculty from all of the colleges gather together with ISE's staff to explore new ideas, develop materials, and practice using new materials and student-oriented teaching techniques.

As the program was originally projected, these efforts would: (1) provide a more viable educational experience for youth of exceptionally disadvantaged

educational background; (2) improve the overall quality of the institutions and their responsiveness to undergraduate students; and (3) markedly change the previously distant, traditional teaching behavior and attitudes of participating faculty resulting in a new, valued model of the "teacher" on these campuses. These general objectives are more definitively stated in previous ISE publications.

The strategy by which ISE has sought to realize these objectives is through an initial set of conditions agreed to by the presidents of the participating in the programs, and then by placing the primary responsibility for the building of materials and practices, and their evaluation and development, on the teachers and a small staff of resource personnel. The initial conditions include the necessity of colleges agreeing to cooperate in the venture, (the establishment of consoritums of colleges), the establishment of a relatively protected experimental unit on each campus, the initial limiting of both class size and number of classroom hours required of the teacher, the requirement of hiring teachers on an 11 or 12 month basis out of which approximately two of the summer months will be devoted to working on curricular materials and teaching techniques at the summer conference, and some initial plan for expansion of materials and teacher-development procedures across the campus.

ISE's approach to curricular and teacher development, as exemplified by the summer writing conference, begins with a series of assumptions about education, teaching, and students. In simple terms, these would include such things as the belief that education is not static, that educational materials should not present a feeling of finality, and that the learner as well as the teacher should be interactive rather than passive. For a teacher to be effective with students, in the sense of stimulating them to learn, the teacher should be a model of learning as well as a source of knowledge. It follows then that the teacher should reconsider for himself what is worth knowing, and why; that he should appreciate his own sense of intellectual exploration and the diverse possibilities to finding something out. Teaching begins with the premise that the only valid perspective on which learning can be based is that relatively unique perspective the learner brings with him to the classroom; thus, materials, their presentation, and their elicited responses can only be effective by the degree to which they relate to the learner perspective (implying previous experience, understanding of that experience, and various abilities). In practice, the arbitrary authority of the teacher must be relaxed for this student perspective to emerge. The diversity of student perspectives, as well as respect for student intellect, implies the need for greater student participation in both the object of study and the means of study.

The central idea behind the summer writing conference is the gathering together of like-minded individuals for curriculum and instructional development to achieve a "critical mass." Strategically, this may be the most important part of a program of broad educational reform. Teaching freshmen is simply not "valued" on most college campuses; it is usually something from which to escape as quickly as possible. In the same light, the development of good materials and good freshmen courses receives little recognition or reward unless it results in a published textbook. Everything about institutions of higher education reflect this form of simple economics, e.g., (the considerably higher costs of educating upperclassmen and graduate students as compared to freshmen, the higher salaries commanded by researchers and student teachers, etc.), to

recognition by ones peers and institutional recognition. Teachers interested in teaching or in student learning problems work essentially in isolation, usually without support or social reward.

In order to challenge these existing values effectively, teachers must first become aware of each other, engage in similar activities, focus on mutual problems, and be recognized and socially rewarded for their efforts. Out of this should evolve a secondary effect, based largely on the principle that individuals tend to do that which they know and in which they have a vested interest. The third change element comes into play as the teachers begin to feel the intrinsic reward engendered by teaching well and seeing successful results with students. These effects, as they initially develop and improve in terms of both the teachers themselves and the materials produced by teachers, at least theoretically will be observed by differences in students by increased outside recognition, and by changes in general indicies of college success. Students emerging from such a learning environment should be more aware, more active, and more demanding of other teachers. Outside agencies may focus on the experience as a model, funding agencies may use the experience as an argument for the allocation of resources, and outside evaluation or examination be conducted. At the institutional level, attrition and retention of students should be affected (as in the case of one participating college, this specific factor was extremely effective in stimulating change; retention of students went up as students moved from the program to the regular college experience.), choice of majors may be altered, student educational activism should increase. Out of all of these potential results, increasing controversy over the expectations and role of the teacher in a given college should increase. From ISE's standpoint, assuming some or all of this chain of events, the important concern is that a new alternative set of values based on improving undergraduate education without using "standards" to exclude students, has an active role in determining campus policy and activities.

Instrumentation

The Conference Assessment form was composed essentially of three different parts and a general information section. The first part included a series of statements about the materials, the material development procedures in the respective curricular areas, the instructional development procedures in the respective curricular areas, general characteristics of the conference, and quality of conference staff, consultants, and services. All of these items were stated positively. The second section presented a number of statements about the nature and conduct of undergraduate education in general. These statements, on a continuum in relationship to ISE's general posture, ran the gamut from positive, e.g., "The content of a course should be re-examined every year," or "A teacher should encourage a broad range of student discussion," to negative, e.g., "The majority of the material in my course can most effectively be covered by lecture." The third section included a number of open-ended questions allowing the respondent the opportunity to remark on general conference likes and dislikes as well as expectations for the coming school year. The general information section was composed of questions concerning the respondents program participation, length of service in program, length of employment at participating institution, curricular area, employing institution, age range, sex, and race.

For the statements included in the first and second section, four categories of response and a related code were provided:

Response	Code
Strongly Agree	1
Agree with Reservation	2
Disagree with Reservation	3
Strongly Disagree	4

Also in the first section, there were six items in which the respondent was asked to check a position on a continuum which was later coded from one to eight. These questions asked the respondent to rank the relative emphasis in his curricular area from content to method, indicate about how much of his course he intended to deveote to ideas and materials developed during the conference, and rank the conference staff in his area on a list of juxtaposed characteristics, i.e., flexible vs. rigid, democratic vs. authoritarian, content knowledgeable vs. not so knowledgeable, helpful vs. not so helpful. The open-ended questions were not scored or ranked although frequent responses were noted together with more definitive remarks.

Analysis and Presentation

Coded responses to the statements in the first and second sections were treated across a number of breakdowns in two ways. A simple mean for each statement was calculated (the arithmetric average of the one through four responses) and then the positive responses were combined (codes 1 and 2) and likewise the negative responses (codes 3 and 4). The combined numbers were then transformed into percentages of positive respondents and negative respondents. The eight point continuums were treated in essentially the same manner.

All of the items were comparatively broken down according to the respondents' respective curricular areas, their respective sex, race, and length of service in the program. General statistics were generated such as average tendency to rate by breakdowns, proportion of participants responding from a given area, and individual respondent rating tendencies.

For purposes of interpretation, two general rules of thumb were followed. In the case of data transformed into percentage of positive respondents to a given item, it was considered that there was general agreement to the statement if more than 65 percent agreed (approximately two-thirds). Statements with less than 35 percent agreement (approximately one-third) were considered negative, and statements falling between those two ranges were considered mixed or neutral. With the data which had been transformed into means, a slightly broader scheme of interpretation was used. With a total range of three (four minus one) possible, arbitrarily the means were interpreted as follows:

Interpretation	Mean Range
Strongly Agree	1.00-1.49
Agree with Reservation	1.50-2.24
Neutral or Mixed	2.25-2.75
Disagree with Reservations	2.75-3.50
Strongly Disagree	3.51-4.00

In the tables that follow, the overall percentage of agreement and disagreement is presented first, followed by the item mean breakdowns according to curricular area. The data pertaining to the conference evaluation precedes the data on attitudes toward undergraduate instruction. The items on each table are rank-ordered from positive to negative according to the primary mode of presentation (percentages or means). In certain cases, this resulted in minor variations in the order of item presentation from table to table, but in only one instance did this result in a general interpretation difference. The variations are due to the response sub-categories of agreement or disagreement. Thus if an item appears at a more negative position on the mean table than on the percentage table, it reflects more reservation with the amount of agreement or conversely less reservation with the amount of disagreement.

Results and Interpretation

The respondents' attitudes can be briefly summarized as follows:

-- generally favorable to the ISE summer writing conference;

-- clearly pleased with both the quality and utility of the curricular materials developed;

-- committed to more intimate as well as more active teacher involvement in the choice and development of curricular materials;

-- favorable to a broader, more liberal approach to content and conduct of undergraduate education;

-- favorable to greater student involvement and responsibility in the classroom;

-- committed to a greater Black emphasis in education including more Black related studies; and

-- favorable to allowing and dealing with a wide range of student diversity within the context of the regular classroom.

Table I shows the percentage generally agreeing and disagreeing with statements regarding the content, conduct, results, and staff of the summer conference. In every case, more than a majority agreed with each statement. Using the previously discussed interpretation guides, there was general agreement to all but five of the 26 items not including the continuum items. The most disagreement occurred on items relating to participant involvement in determining roles and goals during the conference, the discussion of teaching strategy in relation to materials, the failure to broaden or re-work previous materials, and communication problems, probably related to the size of the conference, between individuals across the conference.

While the items on which there was the most disagreement indicate that these factors need to be taken into consideration for the planning of future conferences, the strength of the agreement on the quality and utility of materials developed during the conference (all over 90 percent agreement), would seem to strongly support the basic purpose and approach inherent in the conference.

TABLE I

Summer Writing Conference Evaluation: Percentage of 13 College Program Teacher Agreement and Disagreement to Individual Statements

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
I am looking forward to using the classroom materials developed in my area.	36	94%	6%	1.38
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of content is good.	38	92%	8%	1.65
In my area, usable classroom materials for the school year were developed.	34	91%	9%	1.58
I found the (conference) staff responsive to my needs.	38	87%	13%	1.68
There was adequate communication between individuals within my discipline.	38	87%	13%	1.78
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of methods is good.	38	84%	16%	1.84
I had the opportunity to become personally involved in determining the goals of my curriculum area.	36	83%	17%	1.75
In my area, I was allowed to contribute to the selection of content and methods.	36	81%	19%	1.80
The summer conference was effective in increasing my knowledge of new strategies or approaches to teaching.	38	79%	21%	1.89

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
The conference provided an effective balance between freedom for individual teachers and a structure for group work.	38	79%	21%	1.92
There was adequate communication between groups within my discipline.	37	78%	22%	1.91
Persons very helpful in the development of curriculum materials were made available	37	78%	22%	1.91
All in all, the goals of the conference were specified with sufficient clarity.	37	78%	22%	1.91
When the materials I needed were not on hand, I was easily able to get them.	37	76%	24%	1.83
All in all, the roles of conference participants were defined with sufficient clarity.	37	76%	24%	2.00
There was an atmosphere of freedom to develop whatever materials I wanted to develop.	35	74%	26%	1.85
All of the materials I needed were readily available.	39	72%	28%	1.94

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
Conference activities r alistically focused on the teaching problems at my college.	38	71%	29%	2.28
The consultants provided in my curriculum area were very helpful.	36	69%	31%	2.08
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of content represents a break with the usual selection.	36	67%	33%	2.13
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of methods represents a break with usual practice.	37	65%	35%	2.10
I was able during the summer conference to help define participant roles further.	34	62%	38%	2.23
The conference effectively developed materials to fill the gaps discovered in previous materials.	39	59%	41%	2.17
I was able during the summer program to help develop further the specification of goals.	38	58%	42%	2.21
Teaching strategy in relation to specific content of materials was always discussed.	38	58%	42%	2.28

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
There was adequate communication between individuals across the entire conference.	37	57%	43%	2.35
NOTE: the following items are based upon an 8 point continuum moving from very negative to very positive.				
Based upon your experience, the ISE staff in your area was:		Negative	Positive	
Negative.....Positive				
Not So Knowledgeable.....Knowledgeable "Content"	34	9%	91%	6.79
Not So Helpful.....Helpful	34	15%	85%	6.29
Rigid.....Flexible	36	31%	69%	5.72
Authoritarian.....Democratic	34	38%	62%	5.50

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

Other results indicate that the respondents were actively involved in the development of methods and materials, that the staff was responsive, that the conference did perform a teacher-skills development function, and that there was participant involvement in the determination of curriculum area goals.

There was slightly less general agreement on certain mechanics of the conference such as obtaining materials, choosing consultants, and the balance between freedom for individuals and structure for group work. However, considering that over three hundred people were involved in the conference, and assuming these general levels of agreement (all in the range of 75 to 80 percent agreement) are generalizable to all participants, it would seem that the planning and management of the conference were quite successful.

The continuum items which asked the respondent to judge the staff on certain qualities all showed a majority responding in a favorable direction. There is almost universal agreement that the curriculum area staffs were "content knowledgeable" and strong agreement that they were "helpful." There is less general agreement on the staffs' "flexibility" and "democracy." These differences also probably indicate partially the problem of management of a conference of that size. On the other hand, they should not be totally dismissed; rather these results indicate that the curriculum area staffs should re-consider their basic procedures and relationships with teachers. The results by curricular area, discussed next, add clarity to these results. Table II shows the mean ratings for conference evaluation items broken down by curriculum area. In terms of general rating of the conference (average rating tendencies), clearly the English teachers strongly agreed with almost all aspects. The humanities teachers also were generally higher in their rating of the conference. Bunched together in the middle were respectively social science, math, and biological science. Observation of the means for these three groups demonstrates that there was no clear pattern of agreement across the different items. Philosophy teachers generally disagreed with the conference more frequently than any other group. The response to the instrument by teachers in the natural science area was so low that it is impossible to draw any conclusions about this area.

Other breakdowns of the results showed some additional trends. Male teachers consistently rated the conference lower than female teachers. White teachers rated the conference less positively than Black teachers. The only exceptions to this latter trend were on the two items related to ease in obtaining materials. This may reflect differences in general comparative experiences. It is also possible that this difference is partially accounted for by the generally more negative attitude of the Philosophy teachers, a majority of which were white.

The results seem to indicate a slight trend according to the number of years having taught in the program. The new teachers tended to rate the conference slightly higher than second year teachers, and second year teachers tended to rate the conference slightly higher than third and fourth year teachers. However, this trend varies considerably according to individual items and may only reflect a difference in the basis for comparison.

Table IIA appears to help summarize the differences between the curriculum areas over their evaluation of the summer conference. For example, the English teachers, who generally rated the conference most highly, indicated that the

TABLE II

Summer Writing Conference Evaluation: 13 College Program Teacher
Mean Item Responses by Total and Respective Curriculum Areas

ITEM	TOTAL	CURRICULUM AREA						
		ENG	HUM	SocSc	MATH	BioSc	PHIL	NatSc
Number of Participants Returning Forms	38	8	6	5	7	4	7	1
Percentage of Total Conference Participants	32%	42%	30%	21%	44%	36%	41%	10%
Average Conference Rating Tendency	1.94	1.47	1.73	1.96	2.00	2.02	2.43	2.19
I am looking forward to using the classroom materials developed in my area.	1.38	1.00	1.20	1.60	1.42	1.25	1.83	1.00
Usable classroom materials for the school year were developed in my area.	1.58	1.28	1.60	1.60	2.00	1.50	1.71	1.00
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of content is good.	1.65	1.28	1.83	1.60	1.57	1.75	2.00	1.00
I found the staff responsive to my needs.	1.68	1.28	1.50	1.40	1.71	1.75	2.28	3.00
I had the opportunity to become personally involved in determining the goals of my curriculum area.	1.75	1.14	1.33	1.20	1.42	1.75	3.00	4.00
There was adequate communication between individuals within my discipline.	1.78	1.28	1.66	1.60	2.28	1.50	2.43	1.00
I was allowed to contribute to the selection of content and methods.	1.80	1.50	1.20	1.40	1.57	1.50	3.14	2.00
When the materials I needed were not on hand I was easily able to get them.	1.83	1.71	1.66	2.75	1.83	2.25	1.71	1.00
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of methods is good.	1.84	1.28	1.83	1.60	1.85	1.75	2.57	2.00
There was an atmosphere of freedom to develop whatever materials I wanted.	1.85	1.14	1.50	1.60	1.43	1.75	3.14	3.00
The summer conference was effective in increasing my knowledge of new strategies or approaches to teaching.	1.89	1.25	1.50	2.00	1.14	1.75	2.71	3.00
There was adequate communication between groups within my discipline.	1.91	1.43	1.66	2.00	2.28	1.50	2.66	1.00
Persons very helpful in the development of curriculum materials were available.	1.91	1.62	1.33	2.40	2.28	2.00	2.00	4.00

* The mean is an average rating on a 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Agree = 1; Agree with reservation = 2; Disagree with Reservation = 3; Strongly Disagree = 4.

TABLE II (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL	CURRICULUM AREA						
		ENG	HUM	SocSc	MATH	BioSc	PHIL	NatSc
All in all, the goals of the conference were specified with sufficient clarity.	1.91	1.75	1.80	2.20	2.28	2.25	2.00	2.00
The conference provided an effective balance between freedom for individual teachers and a structure for group work.	1.92	1.43	1.33	1.60	2.14	2.00	2.71	2.00
All of the materials I needed were readily available.	1.94	1.43	1.66	2.40	2.00	2.25	1.86	2.00
All in all, the roles of conference participants were defined clearly enough.	2.00	1.28	1.60	2.00	2.28	2.25	2.42	2.00
The consultants provided in my curriculum area were very helpful.	2.08	1.42	1.40	2.60	2.14	2.75	2.00	4.00
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of methods represents a break with the usual practice.	2.10	1.57	2.16	2.40	2.16	2.50	2.28	1.00
In my area, in preparation for teaching this fall, the choice of content represents a break with the usual selection.	2.13	1.71	1.20	2.40	2.50	3.50	2.14	1.00
The conference effectively developed material to fill the gaps discovered in previous materials.	2.17	1.43	2.60	1.80	2.14	2.25	2.28	3.00.
I was able during the conference to help develop further the specification of goals.	2.21	1.71	2.16	2.00	2.14	2.25	3.14	3.00
I [illegible]able during the conference to help define those roles further.	2.23	1.60	2.00	2.75	2.00	2.25	3.00	2.00
Teaching strategy in relation to specific content or materials was always discussed adequately in my curriculum area.	2.28	1.57	2.50	1.80	2.28	2.25	3.00	2.00
Conference activities realistically focused on the teaching problems at my college.	2.28	1.87	2.40	2.20	2.86	1.75	2.43	3.00
There was adequate communication between individuals across the entire conference.	2.35	2.14	2.33	2.00	2.28	2.33	2.71	3.00

* The mean is an average rating on a 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Agree = 1; Agree with reservation = 2; Disagree with Reservation = 3; Strongly Disagree = 4.

TABLE IIA

Summer Writing Conference Evaluation: 13 College Program Mean Item Responses for 8 Point Continuum Items by Total and Respective Curriculum Areas

ITEM	TOTAL	CURRICULUM AREA						
		ENG	HUM	SocSc	MATH	BioSc	PHIL	NatSc
In your area, was the relative emphasis too heavily on Content? Just about right? on Method? (The continuum moved from Content = 1, to Just right = 4.5, to Method = 8):	4.00	4.28	3.20	5.60	3.43	3.75	3.86	4.00
How much of your course this coming school year do you expect to devote to materials and ideas developed during the present and previous summers? (None = 1, Half = 4.5, All = 8).	6.47	7.43	5.20	6.40	6.28	6.75	6.50	7.00
Based upon your experience, the ISE conference staff in your area was (Based upon an 8 point continuum in which the very negative quality = 1, the very positive quality = 8):								
Rating: 1 234567 8 — Not So "Content" Knowledgeable ..... Knowledgeable	6.79	7.28	6.60	6.20	6.83	8.00	6.43	6.00
Not So Helpful ..... Helpful	6.29	7.57	6.00	6.00	6.00	7.25	5.28	6.00
Rigid ..... Flexible	5.72	6.62	6.83	7.40	6.17	4.00	3.86	3.00
Authoritarian ..... Democratic	5.50	7.57	7.00	6.20	6.17	4.00	3.00	2.00

* The mean is an average rating on a 1 to 8 scale.

balance between method and content was about right, intended to use almost all of the materials, and rated the staff in that area very positively on all personal dimensions. Humanities teachers while generally positive about the conference indicated too much emphasis on content and planned to use a little more than half of the materials. On the other hand, social science teachers felt the conference was too heavily oriented to method but planned to use most of the materials and were generally favorable to the staff. Math teachers also perceived the conference as too content oriented, but planned to use most of the materials and were fairly favorable to their staff. Biological Science and philosophy teachers were similar in that they felt the conference was slightly content oriented, but planned to use most of the materials. However, while they both rated their respective staff high on content knowledge and helpfulness, their ratings on flexibility and democratic procedures were quite low. In summary, it is reasonable to say that none of the summer conference curriculum areas were rated badly by the teachers across the board, but with the exception of the English staff and program, in each area, different weaknesses were implied which should be examined before subsequent conferences.

The percentage of agreement and disagreement to statements concerning undergraduate education are shown in Table III. There is a much broader range of opinion on these items running from 100 percent agreement ("The teacher should have a clear sense of what is important in the course") to 3 percent agreement ("The majority of material in my course can most effectively be coverec by lecture"). Also, there is a relatively good balance between the number of items for which there is general agreement (14) and the number of items for which there is general disagreement (12). Nine items fall into the neutral or mixed range of opinion. Although the distribution of opinion is skewed slightly in the disagreement direction, the distribution appears to be normal. This maybe interpreted as an indication that the respondents were discriminating between items, adding strength to the conclusion that the summer conference evaluation section represents a generally favorable assessment of the conference rather than just a "halo effect."

Qualitatively, the results for this section are favorable too. The items for which there is general agreement for the most part relate well to the teacher development objectives set by ISE. These include agreement with the importance of re-examining course content every year, building a broader basis for undergraduate instruction including both personal development of students and a more relevant, contemporary course-credit structure allowing students more decision in the classroom and greater determination of their own programs, and building materials for use in the classroom which allow for more entering diversity among students. Conversely, the items generally disagreed with are more traditionally oriented to teacher authority, highly structured programs, and delimited admissions-entrance standards. Both the agreed upon and disagreed upon items reflect a dissatisfaction with singular learning objectives and singular learning assessment methods.

The neutral items are in many ways as revealing as the items to which there is general agreement and disagreement. There is uncertainty about the degree of teacher-directiveness in the classroom, the role of grades, the necessity of required attendence in class, and who should govern the institutions. And while there is general disagreement to a raising of admissions standards in the institutions, there is a mixture of opinion as to whether admission standards

TABLE III

Attitudes Toward Undergraduate Education: (Same as Table I)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
The teacher should have a clear sense of what is important in the course.	39	100%	---	1.28
Any institution with a substantial number of black students should offer a program of Black Studies if they wish it.	40	97.5%	2.5%	1.40
The content of a course should be re-examined every year.	38	97%	3%	1.11
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if course work were more relevant to contemporary life and problems.	39	97%	3%	1.46
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if more attention were paid to the emotional growth of students.	40	92%	8%	1.65
A teacher should encourage a broad range of student discussion.	39	92%	8%	1.36
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if students could obtain credit for a year of community service.	39	82%	18%	1.84
Most undergraduates are mature enough to be given more responsibility for their own education.	39	82%	18%	1.85

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

TABLE III (Continued)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
Most colleges reward conformity and crush student creativity.	38	79%	21%	1.89
My department (program or department) has taken steps to increase undergraduate student participation in its decisions.	33	76%	24%	1.94
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more broad liberal education.	39	74%	26%	2.00
Any special academic program for black students should be administered and controlled by black people.	38	74%	26%	2.05
Greater effort should be made to provide remedial work in the context of the regular classroom work.	38	74%	26%	2.16
Some genuinely interested students drop out because they do not want to "play the game" or "beat the system."	37	65%	35%	2.05
Teachers should direct student discussion.	39	62%	38%	2.33

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

TABLE III (Continued)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if grades were abolished.	39	62%	38%	2.38
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if colleges and universities were governed completely by students and faculty.	39	59%	41%	2.38
More remedial undergraduates should be admitted to my institution even if it means relaxing normal academic standards of admission.	39	59%	41%	2.41
Students should play a role at least equal to that of the teacher in determining the content of the course.	38	58%	42%	2.37
Most faculty at my institution are strongly interested in the problems of undergrads.	35	54%	46%	2.46
The teacher should grade closely according to a set of objective standards.	39	51%	49%	2.43
All students should be required to attend class.	39	51%	49%	2.61

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

TABLE III (Continued)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
There is a body of information in my discipline which should be systematically presented.	36	50%	50%	2.44
First year courses should cover the prerequisites for the departmental majors.	39	36%	64%	2.85
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if all courses were elective.	39	36%	64%	2.95
Student discussion in class is most effective when directed toward a teacher's previous presentation.	38	34%	66%	2.88
Every effort should be made to cover predetermined course content.	38	32%	68%	2.87
Students are generally not prepared to work at the level demanded by my course(s).	39	26%	74%	2.85
Many student learning opportunities are lost by allowing too much student freedom in the course.	38	26%	74%	2.97
Colleges should raise their admissions standards.	38	23%	77%	3.08

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

TABLE III (Continued)

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE AGREE	PERCENTAGE DISAGREE	ITEM MEAN*
A person can be an effective teacher without personally involving himself with his students.	39	21%	79%	3.21
All students should choose a major early in their freshman year.	38	11%	89%	3.45
Written examinations are the most effective means of assessing individual student learning.	39	10%	90%	3.38
Course materials should be tightly organized and presented according to that organization.	39	10%	90%	3.43
The majority of material in my course can most effectively be covered by lecture.	38	3%	97%	3.58

* Average rating on 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Disagree = 4; Disagree with reservations = 3; Agree with reservations = 2; Strongly Agree = 1.

should be reduced. A certain feeling of vagueness about the role of the teacher in judging and rewarding the performance of students also seems to exist. For example, there is general disagreement that written examinations are best for assessing student learning and general agreement that currently colleges are crushing creativity and rewarding conformity, but the response is mixed as to whether teachers should grade closely according to a set of objective standards.

These neutral responses probably reflect most clearly the problems with which teachers are faced institutionally. Having known no model of teaching other than one of relatively strict teacher-authority in which the primary means of instruction is the lecture, and the primary means of assessing student learning is the objective test, problems as well as confusion are bound to be encountered in the process of changing this model. Students have learned to expect grades for their performance based upon narrow assessments of their learning. Students coming from weak, essentially negative educational backgrounds may attempt to escape class if not required, and teachers are probably threatened by lack of attendance. A history of a system of education in which authority was only vertically distributed would probably result in a decreased feeling of the capability to govern oneself. And the more the teacher relinquishes authority in the classroom, the more responsive he must be to students and the more he must exhibit legitimate intellectual leadership to maintain control. These and other problems coupled with general institutional disregard for undergraduate instruction would seem to represent the thorniest dilemmas for curriculum innovation and instructional development.

The mean responses to undergraduate education broken down by curriculum area are shown on Table IV. The results indicate very little differences between the curriculum areas on items for which there was relatively strong agreement or disagreement. However, as would be expected with the small numbers in each category, there are some rather wide differences between curriculum areas on items for which there was only moderate agreement or disagreement or mixed results. For example, the curriculum areas differ widely on their responses to the necessity of Black people controlling academic programs for Black students. The differences in responses to this item may reflect either actual curricular experiences and beliefs or it may simply reflect arbitrarily grouped individual responses implying no more than a wide range of beliefs on the subject.

Some of the differences between curriculum areas are accounted for by the general rating tendencies of each group (see Table IVA). The general tendency to rate all items was highest for the philosophy teachers followed by humanities, biological science, math, English, and social science. Again, no estimate for the physical science teachers can be made due to the low percentage of respondents in that category. Following the general rating tendency is the rating tendency for items on which there was general agreement (on the basis of all respondents). These results across curricular areas support the previous generalization that there was little difference between curriculum areas over items on which there was general agreement. The rating tendency for neutral or mixed items, shown immediately below, indicates a greater degree of difference between the curriculum areas, and the rating tendency for items on which there was general disagreement (on the basis of all respondents), indicates the largest differences between curriculum areas. At the bottom of

TABLE IV

Attitudes Toward Undergraduate Education: (Same as Table II)

ITEM	TOTAL	CURRICULUM AREA						
		ENG	HUM	SocSc	MATH	BioSc	PHIL	NatSc
Number of Participants Returning Forms	38	8	6	5	7	4	7	1
Percentage of Total Conference Participants	32%	42%	30%	21%	44%	36%	41%	10%
The content of a course should be reviewed every year.	1.11	1.00	1.00	1.40	1.14	1.00	1.14	1.00
A teacher should encourage a broad range of student discussion.	1.36	1.14	1.50	1.40	1.42	1.25	1.28	3.00
The teacher should have a clear sense of what is important in the course.	1.28	1.14	1.33	1.40	1.14	1.50	1.42	1.00
Any institution with substantial number of black students should offer a program of Black Studies if they wish it.	1.40	1.37	1.16	1.60	1.71	1.25	1.28	1.00
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if course work were more relevant to contemporary life and problems.	1.46	1.25	1.40	1.60	1.57	1.50	1.42	1.00
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if more attention were paid to the emotional growth of students.	1.65	1.50	1.50	1.60	1.57	2.25	1.42	1.00
Undergraduate education would be improved if students could obtain credit for a year in community service.	1.84	1.28	1.66	1.80	2.28	2.25	1.71	1.00
Most undergraduates are mature enough to be given more responsibility for their own education.	1.85	1.87	1.50	1.60	2.86	1.75	1.86	1.00
Most colleges reward conformity and crush student creativity.	1.89	1.42	2.16	2.20	1.71	1.50	1.83	2.00
My department (program) has taken steps to increase student participation in its decisions.	1.94	2.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.33	2.17	2.00

* The mean is an average rating on a 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Agree = 1; Agree with reservation = 2; Disagree with Reservation = 3; Strongly Disagree = 4.

TABLE IV (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL	CURRICULUM AREA						
		ENG	HUM	SocSc	MATH	BioSc	PHIL	NatSc
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education.	2.00	2.28	1.66	2.40	2.14	2.50	1.85	1.00
Some genuinely interested students drop out because they do not want to "play the game" or "beat the system."	2.05	2.00	1.60	2.40	2.43	1.75	2.17	1.00
Any academic program for black students should be administered and controlled by black people.	2.05	2.85	2.00	2.00	1.42	1.50	1.85	3.00
Greater effort should be made to provide remedial work in the context of the regular classroom work.	2.16	2.66	1.83	1.80	2.70	2.25	1.66	2.00
Teachers should direct student discussion.	2.33	2.71	2.00	2.40	2.14	2.00	2.57	3.00
Students should play a role at least equal to that of the teacher in determining the content of the course.	2.37	2.28	2.00	2.40	2.57	2.25	2.57	2.00
Undergraduate education would be improved if colleges and universities were governed completely by their students and faculty.	2.38	2.42	2.16	2.80	2.42	2.50	2.14	4.00
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if grades were abolished.	2.38	2.42	2.33	2.60	2.00	2.75	2.42	2.00
More "remedial" undergraduates should be admitted to my institution even if it means relaxing academic admissions standards.	2.41	2.57	2.66	2.40	2.00	2.75	1.85	3.00
The teacher should grade closely according to a set of objective standards.	2.43	2.42	2.66	2.60	2.57	2.50	2.14	2.00
There is a body of information in my discipline which should be systematically presented.	2.44	1.83	2.50	2.80	2.71	3.00	2.42	1.00

* The mean is an average rating on a 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Agree = 1; Agree with reservation = 2; Disagree with Reservation = 3; Strongly Disagree = 4.

TABLE IV (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL	CURRICULUM AREA						
		ENG	HUM	SocSc	MATH	BioSc	PHIL	NatSc
Most faculty at my institution are strongly interested in problems of undergraduates.	2.46	2.43	2.25	2.40	2.83	2.00	2.28	3.00
All students should be required to attend class.	2.61	2.14	2.50	2.20	2.71	3.00	3.00	3.00
First year courses should cover the prerequisites for departmental majors.	2.85	2.50	3.83	3.00	2.28	2.75	2.42	3.00
Students are generally not prepared to work at the level demanded by my course(s).	2.85	3.00	2.80	2.80	2.57	2.75	3.00	2.00
Every effort should be made to cover predetermined course content.	2.87	3.33	2.16	2.80	3.00	3.00	2.57	4.00
Student discussion in class is most effect- when directed toward a teacher's previous discussion.	2.88	3.60	3.16	2.80	2.33	2.50	2.85	3.00
Undergraduate education in America would be improved if all courses were elective.	2.95	3.42	2.16	3.40	2.57	2.50	3.28	2.00
Many learning opportunities are lost by allowing too much student freedom in the course.	2.97	2.85	3.00	2.80	3.14	3.00	3.00	4.00
Colleges should raise admission standards.	3.08	2.86	3.33	3.00	3.00	2.75	3.28	4.00
A teacher can be effective without personally involving himself with his students	3.21	3.00	3.17	3.20	3.42	3.25	3.14	3.00
Written examinations are the most effective means of assessing a student's learning.	3.38	3.87	3.00	3.40	3.57	2.50	3.14	4.00
Course materials should be tightly organized and presented according to that organization.	3.43	3.71	3.66	3.80	3.57	3.50	2.57	4.00
All students should choose a major early in their freshman year.	3.45	3.33	4.00	3.20	3.42	3.00	3.28	4.00
The majority of material in my course can most effectively be covered by lecture.	3.58	4.00	3.83	3.60	3.42	3.50	3.14	4.00

* The mean is an average rating on a 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Agree = 1; Agree with reservation = 2; Disagree with Reservation = 3; Strongly Disagree = 4.

Table IVA, the range between rating tendencies for general agreement items and general disagreement items is shown. While the total rating tendency is a crude measure of central tendency, the range between agreement and disagreement tendencies is a crude measure of variability. The results indicate that the humanities teachers discriminated most widely between items followed respectively by English, social science, philosophy, biological science and math.

Open-ended Questions

Responses to the open-ended questions paralleled the results observed on the more formal conference evaluation, but also added a few additional considerations. There is still a controversy over where the conference should be held. Some respondents felt the conference should be held at a central location in the South. Others liked the Boston area, and some teachers did not care as long as the conference was located near adequate library and other resource material. Greater contact between curriculum areas was another commonly expressed need. Several teachers suggested the circulation of digests or summary statements by each of the curriculum areas including such things as changes in previous materials, new materials being developed, new techniques or approaches being tried, and the announcement of special programs, speakers, or activities.

The types of problems envisioned by teachers included general problems associated with the institutions such as scheduling, obtaining materials, heaviness of teaching loads, credit-grade problems, lack of space, and lack of responsiveness by the administration to students. Most of the teachers perceived some problem in implementing the program across the entire college; a typical comment was that traditional teachers and administrators were still unwilling to relinquish their arbitrary authority over students and direction of the classroom. A number of teachers talked of Program expansion beyond the participating institutions into other colleges, high schools, and even elementary schools.

Most importantly from ISE's standpoint, a consistent trend of student concern ran through the open-ended comments. Many teachers made reference to the need and desirability of extending the student's college experience beyond the classroom. Making learning more exciting and active, greater relevance and community involvement as part of the curricular experience, and stimulating critical thought and a questioning attitude by direct involvement of students were common remarks. Some teachers were concerned about treating students with more dignity, with providing them with greater voice in both Program and institutional affairs, and with involving more "radical" students.

While the conference and the Program were generally viewed favorably, several comments indicated a concern over the possibility that rigidity or too formal a structure was beginning to develop. This was seen as the antithesis of innovation and change. Examples included too much central Program administration, not enough teacher participation in goals and decisions, and the authoritarian atmosphere at times within certain disciplines. Other concerns were related to the care taken in the selection of Program teachers (strictly an institutional prerogative), polarization among teachers and curriculum areas, and the lack of coordination between the development of materials and the development of instructional approaches.

TABLE IVA

Attitudes Toward Undergraduate Education: Average Rating Tendencies by Total, General Agreement Items: General Disagreement Items and Neutral Items for All 13 College Program Teachers and Across Curriculum Areas.

ITEM	TOTAL	CURRICULUM AREA						
		ENG	HUM	SocSc	MATH	BioSc	PHIL	NatSc
Average Rating Tendency for All Items (35)	2.38	2.41	2.31	2.44	2.41	2.35	2.29	2.43
Average Rating Tendency: Items for which there was General Agreement (14 items)	1.72	1.70	1.56	1.80	1.86	1.75	1.65	1.50
Average Rating Tendency: Neutral or Mixed Items (9 items)	2.42	2.36	2.34	2.51	2.44	2.53	2.38	2.55
Average Rating Tendency: Items for which there was General Disagreement (12)	3.12	3.29	3.17	3.15	3.02	2.92	2.97	3.42
Range between Average Rating Tendency for General Agreement Items and General Disagreement Items	1.40	1.59	1.61	1.35	1.16	1.17	1.32	1.92

* The mean is an average rating on a 1 to 4 scale: Strongly Agree = 1; Agree with reservation = 2; Disagree with Reservation = 3; Strongly Disagree = 4.

Discussion

While the results appear generally favorable to the content and conduct of the summer conference, and the attitudes toward undergraduate education generally agree with ISE's philosophy and approach to educational innovation, there are two important qualifications which limit the ability to generalize from the data. First, the number of respondents to the instrument was low. Only approximately one-third of the 119 Thirteen College Program teachers in attendance at the conference returned completed forms, probably due, in part, to the lateness of their distribution. Sources close to the teachers also indicated that some teachers resisted completing the forms because they could be personnaly identified by combinations of responses to background information items, although an introduction to the instrument clearly stated that all respondents would remain anonymous. Therefore, to assume that these results represent the attitudes of teachers in the Thirteen College Program is statistically impossible. However, at least for the conference evaluation section, the results did not differ noticably from the results of a study of the attitudes toward the previous year's summer writing conference.

A second more general qualification on the use of these results to support the success of program activities is the necessity of assuming: (1) that the attitudes reflect, or imply the development of, desired teaching behaviors, and (2) that the attitudes were not present in similar fashion before the teachers began their participation in the Program. These qualifications are not as serious as the low number of respondents. Observation of teaching activity both during the conference and during the academic year indicate the development of a new style, and the amount and quality of materials developed by teachers during the conference substantiate the level of teacher involvement in this activity. Moreover, it does not really matter, other than methodologically, whether or not the teachers were positively inclined to ISE's approach before joining the Program. While it would be important to say that the Program and its summer conference had significantly changed teacher behavior, from ISE's standpoint, it is equally important to say that the Program and its summer conference provided the vehicle for likeminded individuals to gather for the purpose of improving and refining undergraduate education, no matter what their past experience. The results, of this study as well as observations by individuals both inside and outside the program, support at least this latter contention.

Irrespective of any potential limiations, these results do have both value and substance. From a programmatic perspective, the results do seem to support many of the underlying principles with regard to both teacher attitudes and the general ISE approach to curriculum and instructional innovation. The results are relatively consistent across the different items and parts of the instrument, but at the same time, they identify strengths as well as weaknesses. From a methodological standpoint, the results do discriminate both within items and across curriculum areas. In both the responses to the presented statements and the responses to the open-ended questions, cues for improvement and potential new directions to follow are provided.

Recent literature in higher education has been quite disparaging of predominantly Black institutions of higher education (see for example, Jencks and Riesman, 1968; Bayer and Boruch, 1969). The criticism revolves around

academic weaknesses and institutional rigidity, which the authors see, or at least color, as incurable problems, not worth the cost of setting right. A forthcoming ISE paper will deal more extensively with recent criticism of Black colleges, but for the moment two remarks are pertinent. First, most criticism smacks too clearly of a concern for the maintinance of normative "standards" by which Black youth have been denied educational opportunity for the past 100 years. It is now clearly possible for any Black youth with reasonable academic credentials (by normative white standards) to attend northern predominantly white institutions, although his chances of finishing are limited. It is also clear that at present, hundreds of thousands of Black youth will not meet these critieria. For the vast majority of Black youth, the predominantly Black college is the only feasible educational alternative - financially, academically, and out of actual concern for their growth and welfare. Second, the educational problems facing predominantly white institutions though different from the predominantly Black college in both origin and degree are equally severe with no immediate prospect of internal reform.

The Thirteen College Program and other similar activities are beginning to show what positive sorts of results can be accomplished by working within the predominantly Black colleges. It follows the simple principle that progress comes as a result of allowing individuals within the area where progress is desired the opportunity and support to develop. In this study, it is clear that the teachers responding do appreciate the opportunity, that they feel progress has been made, that usable, student-oriented materials have been developed. The attitudes toward undergraduate education from the ISE perspective are more widely held than those exhibited by college professors on a national basis. Using comparatively the American Council on Education's recent study of the attitudes of faculty,[7] the teachers in this study responding to similar items were on the average, 20 percentage points higher in agreement than the national averages. At least at this level of difference, the 13 College teachers felt undergraduate education would be improved if course work were more relevant, if more attention were paid to the emotional growth of students, if credit could be obtained for community service, if undergraduates were given more responsiblity for their own education, and if there was less emphasis on specialization and more on broad liberal education.

Taken independently, these results have limited meaning. But put in the context of other ISE evaluative results,[8] they add to the general understanding of, and support for, the Program approach. More 13 College Program students stay in school; they do as well as or better than students in the same colleges on grades and achievement tests. They have shown significant improvement on verbal skills instruments, and perhaps most importantly, they have shown valuable personality changes beyond those of their peers which portend continued development. Over the past four years, a large volume of materials has been developed, improved, and used in the classroom by its authors. Through outside observers' reports and the reports submitted by the teachers themselves, real strides have been made in classroom approaches and involvement of students.

These results also indicate a number of serious problems, a degree of confusion over certain issues, and perhaps a tendency to "halo" all Program efforts. Since there has been no panacea discovered for education, this is to be expected, and more importantly, is the substance of future development. But most important, these results and the programs they represent are the teachers own doings, not simply the overlay of someone else's materials or the weak copy of some other program model.

FOOTNOTES

1. Institutional members of the Thirteen College Program include: Alabama A. and M. College, Bennett College, Bishop College, Clark College, Florida A. and M. University, Jackson State College, Lincoln University, Mary Holmes College, Memphis State University, Norfolk State College, North Carolina A. and T. State University, Southern University, Talladega College, Tennessee A. and I. State University, and Voorhees College.

2. Institutional members of the Five College Consortium: Elizabeth City State College, Langston University, St. Augustine's College, Southern University at Shreveport, Texas Southern University.

3. Institutional members of the Three Universities Consortium: Atlanta University, Fisk University, and Memphis State University.

4. The courses include: Ideas and Expression (English), Quantitative and Analytical Thinking (Mathematics), Biology, Humanities, Physical Science, Social Institutions, and Philosophy.

5. Alan E. Bayer, College and University Faculty: A statistical Description. Washington, D.C., The American Council on Education, 1970.

6. Chistopher Jenchs and David Riesman, "The American Negro College," Harvard Educational Review, 37:1, 1967.

   Alan Bayer and Robert Boruch, "Black and White Freshmen Entering Four-Year Colleges," Educational Record, Fall, 1969.

7. Bayer, "College and University Faculty," op. cit.

8. ISE's evaluationsl results are included in previous publications and reports to funding agencies. A four-year summary, to be published during the summer 1971, is now being prepared.